

Democracy in Kazakhstan: Historical Fiction or Reality

Nurlykhan B. Adilzhanov^a, Svetlana B. Kozhirova^a,
and Rouben Azizian^b

^aL. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, KAZAKHSTAN;
^bThe Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies, Honolulu, USA.

ABSTRACT

An important issue in the development of transitional societies at the present stage of historical development is the impact of "global democracy" system of government. Trends of such influence in the post-Soviet space, in particular, are becoming more tangible in the context of globalization and especially after the so-called "color revolutions" that took place in Georgia, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan and which, of course, led to violation of the existing social-political balance. The main problem that arises due to associated with the fact that global democracy is now replaced by the Americanization. On this basis there are no guarantees that the system of democratic values, which polarized American society, and could be a priority within the global community. Issues examined on the basis of the democratic potential of Kazakhstan. To ensure the democratization of the state governance system in Kazakhstan, it is expedient to establish clear rules of fairness, such as the creation by citizens, civil society, the exclusion of the state from the private sphere of interests, ensure the rule of law, civil initiatives and human rights. These are the main criteria by which developing Western civilization, and they may be adapted to the realities of the development of any type of society, especially Kazakh.

KEYWORDS

Global democratization; politics of Kazakhstan;
modernization of the state; democratic society;
the system of social values.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 5 June 2016
Revised 20 October 2016
Accepted 3 November 2016

Introduction

Global democracy as a relatively new phenomenon brought about by globalization, represents the formation and implementation of a universal system of political values that can be implemented on a parity basis within the framework of any society regardless of its level of geopolitical development and the strategy of its domestic or foreign policy (Ahmetova, 2014; Evseev, 2013; Bossuyt & Kubicek, 2015).

Natural global democracy associated with Western European vector of social development, characterized the existing system of democratic values, but this does not necessarily mean that these values can be separated and, accordingly, implemented in the framework of every society (Fawn, 2013;

CORRESPONDENCE Nurlykhan B. Adilzhanov ✉ nurlyhan888@mail.ru

© 2016 Adilzhanov et al. Open Access terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) apply. The license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, on the condition that users give exact credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if they made any changes.



Nowicki, 2000; Nurmakov, 2016). Particularly, these values may differ between countries with different historical-cultural premises, traditions and historical experience of development. In no way global democracy is not taken into account the historical continuity in the dissemination of relevant democratic values, first of all, we are talking about "expansive" spaces standards in public life, and legitimize the individual state. In addition, here before the last there is a dilemma - to resist or blindly accept challenges from other states, which is trying to "impose" its democratic values (Ospanov, 2012; Brudney & Nezhina, 2005; Matveev et al., 2016). It should also be noted that democratic values could never have a clear understanding: what is the basis of democracy for one state is not necessarily uniquely can be perceived by another. Here, the main role should belong to the socio-historical and cultural values, traditions, stereotypes, conditions and factors, compliance and confession, which indicates a strong, efficient state.

To the greatest extent the influence of global democracy has undergone a post-Soviet and post-socialist states, which first lost its historical continuity, adopting the so-called "universal value system" democratic development (Bukikkio, Bljer & Krol, 2015; Narbaev & Zhaksybekov, 2013; Nurligenova, Nygmetova & Zhienbaev, 2015). This value system mostly proved to be extremely abstract. This is evidenced by the experience of Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary, who were among the first residents who passed the examination for global democracy." Thus, the "Czechoslovak model of democracy, which for the neighbors seemed unshakable sample, in the end suffered some hypertrophy, leading to complete monopolization of the socio-political life. A transformation under the impact of the global democracy suffered a public development of Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, Slovenia, who embarked on the path of sustainable development only through the achievement of an appropriate level of democratic development, the criteria of which was determined by the world powers or transnational associations (Narbaev & Zhaksybekov, 2013; Fawn, 2013).

Literature Review

Hostage to impact global democracy was also Serbia and Croatia, which, although had enough inherited experience of democratic development was still open to the perception of the impact of foreign standards, democratization of social development. An important issue is determining whether the impact of the global democracy can be so devastating to the transition of society than anti-democratic domestic policies of individual states (Bossuyt & Kubicek, 2015; Brudney & Nezhina, 2005). This is clear evidence that effective state can have a democratic internal politics and because the influence of the global standards of democracy within that state can only enhance its potential within the global space.

In the context of the latest research on the subject of special attention is the concept of Y. A. Kudryashova, which proves that in modern states of Central Asia democracy is very imperfect, still quite immature, has many deficiencies, and far enough from selected European examples (Nurmakov, 2016; Sordi,

2016). Therefore, according to the researcher, the impact of global democracy within these countries depends on the level of political and economic pressure from the European Union, which defines the standards of democratization of the respective spheres of public life.

Aim of the Study

The purpose of this article is to carry out a conceptual analysis of the influence of democracy on the development of state administration system of Kazakhstan.

Research questions

What is the essence of global democracy, its basic elements?

The effect of global democracy on the policy of Kazakhstan?

Method

The study of various aspects of the process of developing a democratic system is possible on the basis of combining various methodologies with the greatest explanatory potential. The diversity of historical, social and legal reality, the complexity of the object of research require synthesis of the methodological principles of a number of Sciences, applying them based on interdisciplinary methods, and relationships.

Along common methods that have wide usage, such as systemic, historical and legal, comparative, ethical and other, modern science developed a methodology for systematizing the increasing amount of legal knowledge. They include statistical method, classification methods and system-structural analysis synergistic methods.

In addition, the paper summarizes the experience of scientists considering this issue.

Data, Analysis, and Results

Today the influence of global democracy is aimed at creating democratic prerequisites of social development, but rather on the preparation of possible implementation of democratic choice. In this respect, we are talking about a form of global democracy as global democracy education that can be implemented by those states that had reached its climax, and to ensure the dissemination of standards development in the context of globalization.

One of the mechanisms for the implementation of this form of global democracy is a mechanism of "global democracy". He, in turn, characterizes the direct and active participation of individual states in establishing public policy and public-management practices of another state. Here actually we are talking about the development of appropriate ideologies of globalization and its immediate implementation within individual states. This form of intervention by other states can have, in our opinion, the relevant levels (why there is a "color revolution"), namely the level of revolutionary expediency (when the aim is a revolutionary way to change the established socio-political order in the world), military necessity (a separate state has resorted to implementing the principles



of global democracy only to solve its internal problems of social development), the democratic manipulation (we are talking about the introduction of illegitimate democratic values, which can lead to the weakening of the state management system of the society concerned, thus allowing to manipulate another state). The last level of implementation of the global democracy is particularly interesting as it can characterize the current state of political situation in Kazakhstan (Nurmakov, 2016).

Realizing global democracy as something completely different from the objective state of affairs and preventing impartial development of individual companies, it is advisable to find some positive aspects in the deployment of this phenomenon. For example, if the system of democratic values, declared a separate state or transnational corporation have self-sufficient character, revealing axiological and humanistic content, in this case, it may be useful for the development of individual states (Ahmetova, 2014). In this context, global democracy may provide citizens the possibility of exercising strategic choices, assistance in establishing democratic institutions, social development, thus aims at sustainable development of the society (Fawn, 2013). An important factor in the impact of global democracy and that it introduces a certain flexibility into the system of social organization in the global space, it is only in the case that the system of values, which form the basis for global democracy, really reflects the interests and needs of all stakeholders in global space. The result is a convergence between national communities as they collectively participate in the creation and implementation of democratic values within the global space in general. Primarily here we are talking not only about the association between states that have achieved the identical level of democratic development, and in general of all the states that are at different levels of democratic development, through the exchange of historical experiences they can get the appropriate opportunities for their own development.

In the modern world is becoming increasingly global competition between states for leadership of the democratic development. This is very important because it serves as a stimulating mechanism, which provides pull-up separate transitional societies to international standards of democratic development (Kudrjashova, 2014). However, global democracy declares the laws that uphold the social, economic and political rights, which can be acceptable within the individual states, not the global world as a whole.

This, of course, indicates that the national law of individual states in terms of global democracy is protected and realized in the indirect measure. That is why global democracy is intended to eliminate social injustice, protect fundamental rights of citizens in poor countries, and help the democratic development of those countries. Thus, the realization of global democracy aims to fit into a strategy of democratic development of a separate state, and then it can prove to be effective.

Important risk of global democracy impact is the fact that some donor states proclaim a system of values, for example the protection of human rights, but actually pursue other purposes, mainly to bring to power new political elite, which is beneficial for this state by providing that kind of assistance to the

democratic development of others. Once power is given to aspirational elite, global democracy becomes rhetorically assimilation value, and the government-donor begins to realize their real purpose (Muhamedzhanov, 2011). This, of course, presents risks to democratic development of each state. The most striking evidence of the implementation of this policy, a donor country can be found in the United States and Russia, which, in turn, suggests that global democracy declared the principle of human rights could actually impede its implementation.

In conditions of Kazakhstan's accession to the global post-industrial space with an appropriate statement of the principles of an effective state, there are a number of problems, which hinders the democratization of the social processes of the countries in the new conditions. Significant changes occur not only theoretical paradigm, but also an ideology, values and motives of the respective national community, which actually turns it from an active creator of his ideological and politico-administrative reality, a passive consumer of foreign values (Nowicki, 2000). In this particular perspective, the question of the active participation of citizens in socio-political processes raises, which in turn would give them the opportunity to defend regulated system of values. In this regard, the government should care not just declarative principles of democratization and real, giving citizens new possibilities of democratization of a private system of social development. This, in turn, points to the axiological-democratic content of the governance system in transitional societies (the state makes everything possible to simplify individual procedures and to develop effective forms of participation of citizens in governance, the subject of the activities of government serve the interests of citizens) (Bukikkio, Bljer & Krol, 2015).

An important role in the realization of global democracy in Kazakhstan is the development of the modern global information and communication technologies, the introduction of which becomes a global (standardized) communicative (virtual) society. This type of society is the criterion of the introduction of postmodernist methodology of social development, which definitely changes the political picture of the world. In the virtual information space, any phenomenon becomes a mega-context, resulting in a wide gap between policy real, objective and policy of information intervention (virtual), which, of course, leads to a crisis of legitimacy of traditional institutions of political power. As a result, the political space is formed according to the principles dictated by the laws of information transparency (Bhuiyan, 2010). It is a manifestation of tendencies of a globalized so-called information democracy. Because the paradox of modern development of information society is that the more modern the society becomes, the more important it is not the Institute and regulations, and by the actors and their image in the virtual political arena.

Quite an important problem for the transition of the society in terms of the impact of global democracy remains the revival of normative theory of justice as necessary conditions of democratization, managerial and political systems (Hasanov & Petrova, 2015). This, in turn, creates a theoretical discourse to clarify the essence of the political situation that is unfolding within the transitional society. Justice is one of the elements, or rather the level of the



social ideal, which establishes the general scheme of interaction between citizens, societies, states on the basis of rights, responsibilities, freedoms, opportunities, virtues etc. Based on the fact that in any society, there is more or less universally accepted system of justice principles that regulates its vital functions at all organization levels, a harmonious combination of freedom and equality in society, the set of moral principles of social order, the basic principles of social structure as the highest form of legitimization of public institutions are required.

One of the most famous American political scientist and analyst of modernity, Samuel Huntington, in the course of examining ways to change the political regime, in which there is a replacement of the old political institutions, but maintained the legal continuity, argues that the process of democracy had a wave-like character since the nineteenth century, each wave cleared the path to the new achievements. According to his calculations, the absolute number of democracies increased from 0 in 1828 to 59 in 1990 (De Vries & Sobis, 2014). Again, the theory proves that today's so-called "third wave" of democratization during this time added to the number of democratic states in almost 30 countries. Moreover, a significant part of this increase had not in the West. Its main provisions are that the trends in income and educational level of the population allows predicting democracy throughout the world be successful in the future, although in some countries there are tides ago, and periods of widespread surrender of positions of the democratic process.

Democracy bestows an aura of legitimacy in contemporary political field: the laws, regulations and policies issued justified when they are democratic, because in the modern era, they provided an important and generally accepted values (Nurligenova, Nygmetova & Zhienbaev, 2015). Democracy acquires new supporters thanks to democratic values. Today they are: civil social consciousness, personal dignity, awareness and protection of their own interests with the interests of society – this is manifested in the conscious and active involvement of citizens in public life. It is also the means of upholding the rights, freedoms, protect their own interests, which ensure the viability and sustainability of democracy.

The democratic process in the modern world has led to the emergence of the so-called "young democracies", which are not yet fully formed democratic institutions. This emergence was facilitated by the division of states into free country with liberal democracy, strong democratic institutions and the country's electoral democracy, basic democratic expression of the people is elections (Evseev, 2013). Nevertheless, when dealing with "young" and "free" democracies should be included in the process of democratization such characteristics as speed. Based on this, it can be argued that the countries of Europe, which to some extent had a connection with the Soviet Union, can be divided into four groups.

The first group includes countries that have passed almost all the stages of democratization and are currently in the final stage. These include countries, such as Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary. The second group is countries that were almost the final stage of Slovakia, Romania, Croatia and the Baltic states.

State of the third group were moving towards democracy, but only political and economic uncertainty of their political course does not allow them to move to another level: Azerbaijan, Ukraine, Russia, Kazakhstan, Armenia, (Brudney & Nezhina, 2005). In addition, the fourth group are countries, such as Albania, Moldova, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan and Belarus – a democratic initiative, which inhibited certain circumstances or reasons. However, characteristics, such as speed, sufficiently changeable, and the country can move from one group to another, depending on the development of democracy, from political decisions to be taken, from the establishment of democratic institutions, and most importantly – on consolidation of democratic forces and the legitimization of the political regime. Electoral or "young" democracies have a Constitution and formally established on the basis of their democratic institutions. The formation of the government is carried out based on regular elections. However, the system of government, social status of the person substantially differs from the liberal democracies. At the expense of the latter, we can distinguish Belarus, where social institutions are well developed. In free countries, the institutions of democracy serve as the necessary mechanisms to ensure civil rights and freedoms, which are an unquestionable value in itself. Nevertheless, in electoral democracies reigns attitude to civil liberties as a means, which ensures the normal progress of the electoral process and minimal participation in it (Belispaev, 2010).

The failure of young democracies has spawned a number of theories seeking to explain the phenomenon of formal democracy and elections without real freedom. In the middle of the first decade of the XXI century, Western political thought took a step toward the legalization proposed in the mid 1980-ies the concept of illiberal democracy. The term illiberal democracy (illiberal democracy) was introduced by the American orientalists to describe the specific modes of the newly industrializing countries of Southeast Asia, which (as later to Taiwan and South Korea) were characterized by combination of elements of formal procedural democracy and rigid authoritarianism. This term was interpreted by foreign analysts are wary, as it implicitly contained a doubt the universal significance of the classical models of democracy, which in foreign science was treated as the only democratic and were worthy of such considered (Ospanov, 2012). American political scientist Fareed Zakaria in 2003 has reinvented the term illiberal democracy to describe the processes of democratization and liberalization in the modern world, giving this term widely known and stimulating a discussion. The modern idea of illiberal democracy is combined with the concept of "authoritarian parliamentarianism" (1984) of the Russian Theorist N. A. Simoniiia, with the difference that the latter contains a set of characteristics that make up the frame of society at the stage of transition from traditional state to the advanced forms of social and political organization.

Formally, an illiberal democracy could be any democracy that is not liberal democracy. However, the term "illiberal democracy" is usually used for special labelling of authoritarianism to representative (representative) democracy, in which representatives of the authorities elected by the people have a propensity for corruption and failure to comply with the law. This leads to the alienation of



people from the current government. Illiberal democratic governments believe that if they have a mandate, they may act as you think advisable, ignoring the laws or the Constitution and holding regular elections. This type of "illiberal democracy" is regarded as a special case in Kazakhstan.

The institutions of civil society experts to a certain extent include elections and referendums. Only when they serve as a means of shaping and revealing public opinion and protecting vested interests. The electoral process in Kazakhstan takes place formally within the Constitution and international democratic practices. In recent years, more and more observers not only from the CIS, but also in the West recognize the elections in Kazakhstan as legitimate and even democratic. There has been a trend towards building parliamentary republics in almost all Central Asian countries (Muradjan, 2010). However, nevertheless, the personal factor and continues to play a crucial role in the political life of these countries, and the violation of the existing balance leads to negative consequences.

Therefore, on 18 May 2007, the Kazakh Parliament has considered and voted the amendments to the Basic law, and the President Nazarbayev signed the Law "On amendments and additions to the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan". In addition, the head of state signed a number of laws: "about the Government", "President", "On elections in the Republic of Kazakhstan "On Parliament and status of its deputies".

It was proposed to go the way of amendments to the Constitution, when the Republic remains presidential, but with the significant expansion of the Parliament powers. This almost transforms the country model from presidential to presidential-parliamentary.

In particular, the amendments to the Constitution of Kazakhstan provides a new procedure for the formation of the Majilis (lower chamber of Parliament). Found that 98 of the 107 Majilis deputies are elected on party lists based on proportional system, and 9 deputies will be elected by the Assembly of peoples of Kazakhstan and to provide the national minorities in Kazakhstan. The number of deputies of the Senate (upper house of Parliament), which is directly appointed by the head of state, is increased from seven to fifteen, the overall composition of the Senate increases to 47 people.

The government of the Republic of Kazakhstan is formed on the basis of the parliamentary majority party, won the elections. The main role in the approval of the Prime Minister, and thus in the formation of the government belongs Majilis. The President will appoint a Prime Minister only after approval of candidates by the Majilis. Meanwhile, the President secured the authority to appoint Ministers for foreign Affairs, defense, internal Affairs and justice. Now, according to N. Nazarbayev, Kazakhstan's Parliament becomes the main "trigger mechanism" for constitutional reform.

In general, adopted in the Basic law amendments will extend the powers of the Parliament and maslikhats, significantly increase the role of parties and the Assembly of peoples of Kazakhstan in the socio-political life of the country.

According to the President of Kazakhstan, "democracy is not the beginning, democracy for us is the end of the road". In addition, the Republic, gradually carrying out reforms moving in this direction. In addition, Nazarbayev stressed that in Asia "other relationships – family, other religion, other possibilities between people". "And hurry us do not, because we are others," he said.

Nazarbayev does not exclude the possibility of Kazakhstan's transition to a different system of political governance. However, this issue can be considered only in case if the people of the country express such a will.

Nazarbayev recalled that the issue of changes in the political system is the issue of the Constitution, which was "adopted by a referendum of all the people, and the changes will also be made by the people." "We can talk about the redistribution of power between the branches: The President, the Parliament and the government. We are considering this issue," – said Nazarbayev.

In 2016 in Kazakhstan, the elections of deputies of the Parliament (Majilis) and the elections of deputies of maslikhats (local representative bodies) were conducted at all levels. According to the CEC of Kazakhstan, the voter turnout amounted to 40,21%. Elections were held openly and transparently; any violations have been recorded.

The elections were attended by six parties: "Nur Otan" ("Light of the Fatherland", the party of power headed by the President of the country), Communist people's party of Kazakhstan (CPPK), "Ak Zhol" ("Bright path"), "Birlik" ("Unity"), the National social democratic party (NSDP), and Auyl ("Village"). Each of the parties have overcome the 7 percent barrier.

In the lists of voters, more than 9.8 million people are registered. In addition, about 14 thousand people of Kazakhstan voted in polling stations abroad. Voting takes place on 65 sites in different countries. Kazakhstan receives more than 60 percent of the electorate, and about two thousand people have made their choice abroad. About 500 of them were in Moscow.

Seats in the legislature are retained by the three parties from the previous Parliament – the party in power "Nur Otan" ("light of the Fatherland"), "Ak Zhol" ("Bright path") and the Communist people's party of Kazakhstan (CPPK).

Discussion and Conclusion

In the absence in Kazakhstan of a consensus on the fundamental values of common equity, there is a conflict of fundamental principles of justice, with the result of the society split. This gives a reason to believe that Kazakhstan is a society of hierarchical type, which is characterized by the following conditions: lack of distribution of moral responsibilities for all (because there are groups that enjoy many privileges without having duties), taking into account the interests not of all citizens, but only the elect; for the invalidity of the priority of the interests of some groups over others; the lack of well-known and recognized concepts of justice; the lack of appropriate technology legitimacy.

In this context it is important problem which is now actively discussed by researchers, namely or possible to do justice in the relations among Nations in terms of the impact of global democracy and the right is an effective means of



ensuring such justice, this justice is a factor of democratization of public life. It is mainly about ensuring equal opportunities for citizens' rights in the global space.

An important role in contemporary processes of global democratization of the system of public administration belongs to postmodernism, which provided a sharp increase flexibility and mobility of modern mobile development world; they have created new forms of identity and showed their historic claim to hegemony. In our opinion, is postmodernism as an ideology can really resist the fundamentalism of the new rules of building national structures of the modern world and to create the necessary conditions to deploy new logic of globalization. It should be noted that postmodernism has a restorative character, which in many ways pushes away from the ideology of European modernism, is not the same as the national commitments of modern societies to uphold the principles of global democracy.

According to many Russian scientists, Kazakhstan postmodern type of social development is the embodiment of social and political forms, which deprives citizens' desire to defend their values in a democratic way (Ahmetova, 2014; Belispaev, 2010). However, postmodernism is, in our opinion, represents the immanent movement of social development that aims at the deconstruction of the institutions of political practice that does not meet the basic principles of reality and contrary to the basic democratic norms of social development. You should not blame the postmodernism in that it creates a democratic nihilism, because it is one of the phases of modern globalization development and it should be perceived as an objective reality and not an imported scenario. Postmodernism in Kazakhstan characterizes the change of epoch-making projects, where the main criterion of development should be the development of creative abilities of the universal advanced political system, able to create our own modern political world in an appropriate democratic modus, which coincides with the processes of globalization. One of the main criteria for the implementation of postmodernism is deconcentration, that is opposed to various ideological layering that does not allow modern man to perceive political reality. This ultimately leads to disappointment and the impossibility of awareness of their impact on the deployment of the political process. Some researchers such person's position in terms of the impact of global democracy called as political-ideological savagery, when she sees only cleverly disguised chaos of political elements and has no desire to interfere in the process of structuring (Muradjan, 2010; Muhamedzhanov, 2011). It is also due to the fact that the processes of globalization are considered as the objectivity and irreversibility of the interdependencies of the modern world, the integration trends that contribute to the formation of common criteria for the development and operation of information and cultural spaces also affect the system of democratization of political and public administrative structures.

Implications and Recommendations

An important issue for global democratization of public administration system is the understanding of the temporal dimensions of the political process

of development of the state coincides with its modernization and reform of political institutions. This problem is directly connected to the idea of the deployment of a global crisis that leads to the creation of a new world order, which imposes certain regulations on the development of the nation state as dynamic integrity. In accordance with this deployment of this global crisis, and hence the emergence of unsustainable development is the result of the political contradictions of globalization and the ambiguity of the world development trends. Here arises the problem of understanding the specific construction of the modern picture of the global world, which fully meet the national criteria for the development of the state. In turn, the relevance of this problem on a global scale due to the understanding of the timing of political and public administrative process in Kazakhstan with global trends dictated by the logic of globalization and the need to establish new positions of individual states on the world stage. Formation, in particular, the new position of Kazakhstan as a democratic state in the post-Soviet space requires presence in the role of stabilizer of global processes and active subject of the process of creating post-transformation and modernization of the world.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Nurlykhan B. Adilzhanov holds a Master Degree at Department of the Eurasian Researches, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.

Svetlana B. Kozhirova holds a Doctor of Political Sciences and now is a Professor of the Department of International Relations, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.

Rouben Azizian holds a PhD and now is a Professor, The Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies, Honolulu, USA.

References

Ahmetova, K. S. (2014). Collective appeals (petitions) and national law-making initiative in democracy system in Kazakhstan and Russia. *Constitutional and municipal law*, 6, 37-42.

Belispaev, A. M. (2010). Power decentralization Institutes. *Perm University bulletin*, 3, 45-50, Jurisprudence Series.

Bhuiyan, S. H. (2010). E-Government in Kazakhstan: Challenges and Its Role to Development. *Public Organization Review*, 10, 31-47.

Bossuyt, F., & Kubicek, P. (2015). Favouring Leaders over Laggards: Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. *The Substance of EU Democracy Promotion: Concepts and Cases*, edited by A. Wetzel & J. Orbie, 177-192. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brudney, J. L., & Nezhina, T. G. (2005). What is Old is New Again: Achieving Effectiveness with Volunteer Programs in Kazakhstan. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 16, 293-308.

Bukikkio, D., Bljer, T., & Krol, D. (2015). Kazakhstan trend: from totalitarianism to democracy and the rule of law (by sight). *Law and the state*, 3 (68), 12-15.

De Vries, M. S., & Sobis, I. (2014). Reluctant Reforms: The Case of Kazakhstan. *Public Organization Review*, 14, 139-157.

Evseev, V. V. (2013). Authoritarianism in Central Asia (for example, Kazakhstan). *Moscow State Institute of International Relations bulletin*, 5(32), 101-107.



Fawn, R. (2013). The Kazakhstan Chairmanship of the OSCE: Internal Conditionality and the Risks of Political Appeasement. In *International Organizations and Internal Conditionality: Making Norms Matter*, 195-230. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hasanov, M. S., & Petrova, V. F. (2015). Genesis and development of democracy in Kazakhstan. *Collection of: Priorities of world science: experiment and scientific discussion. Materials of the 9 International Scientific Conference*, 157-161

Kudrjashova, J. A. (2014). Features of the political system formation in the Republic of Kazakhstan (end of XX – beginning XXI centuries). *Caspian region: politics, economy, culture*, 4(41), 118-126.

Matveev, Y.V., Valieva, E.N., Trubetskayam O.V., Kislov A.G. (2016). Globalization and Regionalization: Institution Aspect. *IEJME-Mathematics Education*, 11(8), 3114-3126.

Muhamedzhanov, J. B. (2011). Kazakhstan: a step towards European democracy? *Modern Europe*, 2(46), 26-36.

Muradjan, V. (2010). Kazakhstan as a "partner for democracy stabilization". *Central Asia and the Caucasus*, 13(2), 173-179.

Narbaev, B. N., & Zhaksybekov, A. S. (2013). Open Society in the Republic of Kazakhstan. *Natural humanities research*, 2, 123-128.

Nowicki, M. E. (2000). Kazakhstan's Nonprofit Sector at a Crossroad on the Great Silk Road. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 11, 217-235.

Nurligenova, Z. N., Nygmetova, N. T., & Zhienbaev, M. B. (2015). Democracy in Kazakhstan: from the beginnings to the present day. *Collection of The Seventh International Conference on Eurasian scientific development Proceedings of the Conference*, 146-150.

Nurmakov, A. (2016). Kazakhstan and the Global Industry of Mega Events: A Case of Autocratic Management. *Mega Events in Post-Soviet Eurasia: Shifting Borderlines of Inclusion and Exclusion*, edited by A. Makarychev & A. Yatsyk, 99-129. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ospanov, K. I. (2012). Some aspects of the initial phase of the development of democracy in modern Kazakhstan. *Kyrgyz Russian Slavic University bulletin*, 12(12), 110-113.

Sordi, A. D. (2016). Legitimation and the Party of Power in Kazakhstan. *Politics and Legitimacy in Post-Soviet Eurasia*, edited by M. Brusis, J. Ahrens, & M. S. Wessel, 72-96. London: Palgrave Macmillan.